

education funds. And, Senator Dierks, that's where your money's going to come from. The money that will...we will not have will be taken out of the education funds, for the most part, for kids. Because when we come back next year and when we come back the year after that, we will not only have to raise revenue now for the revenue that's lost on the cap on the overall levies, but we're going to have to find another \$6 million to replace that which we've already, that we're about ready to lose if this bill is passed. Because that's what it'll be, it'll be \$6 million negative out of our account that we will have to try to replace if we want to stay where we are to when we get to the tax increase debate in the next couple years, which we may not...we still may not do. And at some point, members of the body, we have to put the whole picture together and say, where are the priorities going to be. And do I oppose Senator Dierks' bill for what he's trying to do? No. But when I put it on the scale of priorities of where I want to put \$6 million or where I'd like for it to go, this cannot be, at least in my judgment, personally, I can't have this as a high priority. I would rather keep the \$6 million, save some of the things that, that we're probably going to have vetoed anyway, maybe it's on rape and domestic violence, maybe it's education for fina...schools, who knows, but I'd rather have the dollars now so that when the crisis hits next year I don't have to find 6 million more than what we're going to have to find. And we keep forgetting the fact that we probably will be, at the same time, facing many federal cuts on the budget as well. I suspect that's one of the reasons Senator Warner wanted to do 1290, and I respect him for doing so because we have to have more things in reserve for that which to come. I can't think of a worse time for maybe the right reasons, but I can't think of a worse time to say we're going to now give another \$6 million away to a group that may need it. But to say that others are not going to pay for that or others are not going to suffer for that, I think is erroneous. I think we need to be very clear on our priorities, on when we have dollars that we have available, where we let them go and for what reasons and where we keep them for what reasons and what we want to do with them at that point. And that's why I can't support 106 at this point in time. And I would urge my colleagues to give it very serious consideration as well, not so much on the issue itself on 106, but for the future, next year, and the year after that, where are we going to have the dollars to do what we're going to have to do. This is another chunk that leaves us. And next year will come and